

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 6-9, 13-14 and 19 have been amended, claims 10-11, 15-16 and 20-25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer for filing in a continuation application, and new claims 26-37 have been added. Thus, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-14, 17-19 and 26-37 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

Objection to the Title

In the Office Action mailed December 29, 2005, the title was objected to. The title of the invention has been amended responsive to this objection. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome this objection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Claim Objections

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 24 and 25 were objected to as being substantial duplicates of claims 13 and 14. Claims 24 and 25 have been canceled, thereby rendering the objection moot.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16-21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that the term "electronic

apparatus" in the claims is "incommensurate with the scope of the disclose [sic] since applicants have not disclose [sic] every and all electronic appliances that includes the claimed limitations as set forth in the claims." *Office Action*, p. 3.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection at least because a cellular phone is an electronic apparatus, and therefore, the scope of the claims is commensurate with that of the specification. Further, the application discloses that the invention as claimed is applicable to other electronic devices, such as a PHS, a PDA, etc. Moreover, the Applicant is not required to disclose "every and all electronic appliances that includes the claimed limitations as set forth in the claims," as asserted by the Office Action. For at least these reasons, the Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection. Since claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 17 and 18 were rejected only under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance, and a notice to such effect is respectfully requested.

New claims 26, 29, 32 and 35 depend from claim 1 and new claims 27, 30, 33 and 36 depend from claim 4. It is respectfully submitted that claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 should also be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 4, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 12 has been amended responsive to this rejection. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome this rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Rejections Under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 6-8 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0075244 to Tani et al. (hereinafter, "Tani"). Claims 6-8, 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0081120 to Klindworth (hereinafter, "Klindworth"). Claims 11, 16, 21, 23, 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muramatsu (JP 2001-169158). Claims 11, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al (JP 2002-237985 hereinafter Yoshida). Claims 10, 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,612,733 to Flohr (hereinafter, "Flohr") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,846 to Katsumi (hereinafter, "Katsumi"), and as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0204194 to Akai et al. (hereinafter, "Akai") in view of Katsumi. Claims 11, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,648 to Suso et al (hereinafter "Suso") in view of Yoshida. Claims 11, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Muramatsu. Claims 15, 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Murakawa (JP 06-302169). It is noted that claims 10-11, 15-16 and 20-25 have been canceled and claims 6-9, 13-14 and 19 have been amended. To the extent the rejections apply to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejections, as follows.

Claims 6-8 and 19

Claims 6-8 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated

by Tani and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Klindworth.

Each of independent claims 6 and 19, as amended, is directed to a mobile phone that includes a plurality of capture units capturing a target object, voice input units equal in number to the plurality of capture units, inputting voice corresponding to respective capture units, a selection unit selecting one of the plurality of capture units, and a control unit controlling the plurality of voice input units based on the selection unit.

Tani is directed to a remote monitoring system having a plurality of cameras each having a microphone attached thereto. Klindworth is directed to an audio video security system having a plurality of audio and video sources. However, neither Tani nor Klindworth, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a mobile phone as recited in independent claims 6 and 19.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Tani and Klindworth, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 6 and 19. Therefore, Tani and Klindworth do not anticipate claims 6 and 19, nor are pending claims 6 and 19 obvious in view of the teachings of Tani and Klindworth. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 6 and 19 should be deemed allowable over Tani and Klindworth.

Claims 7-8 and new claims 28, 31, 34 and 37 depend from claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that these seven (7) dependent claims should also be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Claims 10-11, 15-16, 20-24

Claims 11, 16, 21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muramatsu. Claims 11, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida. Claims 10, 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flohr in view of Katsumi, and as being unpatentable over Akai in view of Katsumi. Claims 11, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Yoshida. Claims 11, 21 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Muramatsu. Claims 15, 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso in view of Murakawa.

Claims 10-11, 15-16 and 20-24 have been canceled, thereby rendering these rejections moot.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.



U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/790,192
Attorney Docket No. 101229-00002

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-14, 17-19 and 26-37, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing client matter number 101229-00002.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, PLLC

Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time